

**Citizens Advisory Committee  
Aviation Subcommittee**

---

**Commission Conference Room  
2700 East Airport Service Drive  
Capital City Airport**

**Meeting Minutes**

**May 16, 2008**

**Start Time:** 2:00 p.m.

**Present:** Bill Gehman, Dan DeGraaf, James Koslosky, Sylvester Payne.

**Absent:** Linda Miller-Atkinson, Mike Fikes, Keith Ledbetter, Robert Struck, Kirk Steudle.

**TF2 Members Present:** Roger Salo

Mr. Koslosky made a motion to approve the minutes from the May 1, 2008, seconded by Mr. DeGraaf. Motion carried unanimously.

Matt Brinker (MDOT) and Mark Noel (MDOT) discussed the research that had been conducted on a number of issues subcommittee members inquired about during the May 1, 2008 meeting.

Mr. Gehman discussed the timeline for completing the subcommittee's report, with a draft needed by June 16, 2008.

Mr. Gehman led a discussion of aviation needs, revenues, and alternative scenarios for future investment including the "do nothing" scenario and the good, better and best scenarios.

Mr. Brinker presented material on these issues over which the discussion was centered. Items from the discussion that will be researched or were mentioned as possible recommendations or to include in the final report include:

- Adding a column to the spreadsheet (titled Michigan Aviation Funding Needs 2009-2030) to show anticipated revenue broken out by federal, state and local funds. (Koslosky)
- Adding a column to the spreadsheet (titled Michigan Aviation Funding Needs 2009-2030) to show the "do nothing" scenario. (Koslosky)
- Re-think the "good" scenario, or perhaps acknowledge in the report that "good" represents a situation or scenario that is better than what exists today, but likely would result in aviation infrastructure that would not be considered "good" by anyone with knowledge of the industry. (Salo)
- Is it possible to forecast the rate of deterioration of pavement conditions under alternative scenarios? MDOT will research this. (Gehman)

Mr. Gehman led a discussion of the outline for the Subcommittee's report. Items from the discussion that will be researched or were mentioned as possible recommendations or to include in the final report include:

- Is it possible to look at how successful we have been in obtaining the (federal?) discretionary funding we request? MDOT will research this. (Koslosky)
- Are administrative costs reflected in the needs assessments of the alternative funding scenarios? The sense of the Subcommittee is that all costs should be included in the estimate of future needs and alternative funding scenarios. (Gehman)
- Add to the list of recommended efficiencies the notion that permitting and regulatory fees should be sufficient to cover the cost of administering each program. Can these fees be raised administratively or do they require state legislation? MDOT will research this. (Gehman)
- Subcommittee should examine the programs that MDOT is required to operate to determine if there are some functions that MDOT should be relieved of. (Koslosky)
- The report should emphasize that it is important that airports have a mechanism for implementing their pavement management plans. (Koslosky)

Mr. Gehman led a discussion on funding options. Items from the discussion that will be researched or were mentioned as possible recommendations or to consider for the final report include:

- Examining how the costs of infrastructure or capital projects are allocated among the classes of users. MDOT will research this. (Gehman)
- Should consider the impacts of homeland security issues on airport as an unfunded mandate, which could be a rational basis for seeking GF support for aviation. (DeGraaf)
- Should look closely at the impact free trade zones have on revenue, and whether the SAF should be reimbursed for any lost revenue. (Salo and DeGraaf)

Next scheduled meeting  
June 2, 2008  
2:00 – 4:00 pm  
Bureau of Aeronautics  
Commission Conference Room  
2700 E. Airport Service Drive  
Lansing, MI 48906

End Time: 4:00 pm